

REMARKS

Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51. Claims 1-17 and 20-53 remain pending. In the Final Office Action¹ dated July 7, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40-45, and 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/48678 A1 to Andersson et al. ("*Andersson*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,703,570 B1 to Russell et al. ("*Russell*"); and rejected claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Andersson* in view of *Russell* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,958,747 B2 to Sahlberg et al. ("*Sahlberg*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Examiner Interview of September 21, 2010

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview on September 21, 2010 with Applicants' representatives. Further, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for discussing proposed claims amendments. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 based on suggestions provided by the Examiner during the interview. For at least the reasons discussed during the interview and stated herein, Applicants' claims are patentable over the cited references and favorable action is requested from the Examiner.

¹ The Final Office Action may contain statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In order to advance prosecution, however, Applicants amend claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 1-16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40-45, and 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40-45, and 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Andersson* and *Russell* because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent claim 1 recites an information processing system including, amongst other elements:

an allocation unit configured to assign on command and in response to a selection of a current graphical object from the plurality of graphical objects, from a position data bank, position data for the current graphical object, and to provide allocation data which associates said assigned position data with the current graphical object, wherein the position data represents position code to be printed on the coding layer and the current graphical object represents user-readable graphic information to be printed on the graphical layer . . .

wherein the allocation unit provides said assigned position data to a combining module for printing the graphical layer including the user-readable graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and the coding layer including the position code on the substrate for forming a printed coded base.

On page 4 of the In the Final Office Action, the Examiner concedes that “Andersson does not teach an allocation unit and related elements.” The Final Office Action relies on *Russell* to overcome the deficiencies of *Andersson*. This, however, is not correct.

Russell, considered alone or in combination with *Andersson*, also does not teach or suggest a combination including the claimed allocation unit. *Russell* discloses a “digital pen that has a writing tip includ[ing] an ultrasonic (US) transducer on a pen body that generates frames of US pulses toward a receiver base in response to an infrared (IR) synchronizing signal from the base.” *Russell* at Abstract, Fig. 1. *Russell* further discloses that the “base 16 can include one or more bar code readers 26” that “read bar codes on the substrate 12 to determine form or page number and positions of the fields 12a relative to the base 16” and thereby “processor 22 can determine a virtual location for virtual fields of the virtual counterpart to the actual form substrate 12.” *Russell*, col. 4, ll. 59-65.

The Examiner cites to column 8, lines 1-26 of *Russell* as an alleged teaching of the claimed allocation unit. Final Office Action, page 4. In the cited portion, *Russell* discloses:

By means of reading the bar codes 109, the processor 22 can determine not only the identity of the form, but also the position of the form substrate 12 relative to the base 16

As mentioned above, the processor 22 also accesses a virtual copy of the form, stored in memory either concurrently with handwriting entry or post handwriting entry. Accordingly, when a user writes in an actual form field 108, the position of the writing is determined as described above and then associated with the position of the virtual counterpart of the field 108 and stored in memory. When the

virtual copy of the form is to be printed, the handwriting, now digitized, is printed in the corresponding field.

As discussed during the interview, *Russell* does not teach or suggest “an allocation unit configured to **assign** on command and **in response to a selection of a current graphical object from the plurality of graphical objects**, from a position data bank, position data for the current graphical object . . . , wherein the position data represents **position code to be printed on the coding layer** and the current graphical object represents **user-readable graphic information to be printed on the graphical layer**” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. This is at least because there is no disclosure in *Russell* of assigning position data in response to a selection of a current graphical object from a plurality of graphical objects. As discussed during the interview, at most *Russell* discloses printing substrate 12 including fields 108 and bar code 109. (Figure 8; and column 8, lines 1-11). Neither, fields 108 nor bar code 109 in *Russell* is assigned “in response to a selection of a current graphical object from the plurality of graphical objects” for associating “said assigned position data with the current graphical object,” as recited in claim 1. There is simply no disclosure, for example, of any selection of fields 108 or bar code 109 in *Russell*.

Further, *Russell* does not teach or suggest “an allocation unit configured to assign . . . position data for the current graphical object . . . , wherein the position data represents **position code to be printed on the coding layer** and the current graphical object represents **user-readable graphic information to be printed on the graphical layer**,” (emphasis added) as further recited in claim 1. This is at least because there is no disclosure in *Russell* of, for example, printing fields 108 and bar code 109 on a coding layer and a graphical layer of substrate 12.

As further discussed during the interview, at most *Russell* discloses that a virtual copy of a form can be printed where handwriting is printed in field 108, col. 8, ll. 20-22. Such a disclosure, however, does not constitute an allocation unit that “provides said assigned position data to a combining module for printing the graphical layer including the user-readable graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and the coding layer including the position code on the substrate for forming a printed coded base.” This is at least because *Russell* merely discloses a pre-generated substrate 12 including fields 108 and bar code 109 and there is no disclosure in *Russell* of a “combining module” for “printing the **graphical layer** including the user-readable graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and the **coding layer** including the position code on the substrate for forming a printed coded base,” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the Final Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1, and claim 1 is allowable

Independent claims 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45, and 51, although each different in scope from claim 1 and from each other, are also allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-16, 20, 21, 24, 26-29, 31, 32, 35-38, 40, 42-44, 47-50, 52, and 53 depend from one of the independent claims and are at least allowable over the cited art based on their dependencies on allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40-45, and 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection of Claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Andersson, Russell, and Sahlberg*.

Claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46 depend from one of the independent claims. *Sahlberg* fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of *Andersson* and *Russell*. *Sahlberg* also fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed "allocation unit," as recited in claim 1, and similar recitations in the other independent claims.

Accordingly, *Andersson, Russell, and Sahlberg*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of the independent claims, and dependent claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46. Thus, the rejection of claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 6, 2010

By: 
Elizabeth M. Burke
Reg. No. 38,758

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340